



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,420	01/15/2004	Jun Yamakawa	3673-0165P	3367

2292 7590 07/07/2006

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER
----------

LEE, EDMUND H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1732

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/757,420

Applicant(s)

YAMAKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

EDMUND H. LEE

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/15/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mitoma et al (USPN 5611723). Mitoma et al teach the claimed process as evidenced at col 4, ln 45-col 7, ln 28; and figs 1-21.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitoma et al (USPN 5611723). The above teachings of Mitoma et al (USPN 5611723) are incorporated hereinafter. Mitoma et al do not teach the claimed angle formed by the processing direction and the seam. The angle formed by a processing direction and a seam is well-known in the deburring art as an important parameter and the claimed angle would have been readily determined by routine experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, the claimed angle is well-known in the deburring art thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use the claimed angle in the process of Mitoma et al in order to form a high quality deburred golf ball.

5. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitoma et al (USPN 5611723) in view of Selby (USPN 3073072). In regard to claim 3, Mitoma et al teach the basic claimed process including an attitude regulating step of regulating an attitude of a golf ball having a spew on a seam in such a manner that the seam is placed in a predetermined position (col 4, ln 45-col 7, ln 28; and figs 1-21); and a first processing step of cutting or grinding the spew or the seam by means of a rotary processing tool having a processing direction to be inclined to the seam while rotating the golf ball in a circumferential direction of the seam (col 4, ln 45-col 7, ln 28; and figs 1-21). Mitoma et al, however, do not teach a second processing step of cutting or grinding the spew or seam. Selby teaches a surface grinding machine capable of grinding in a first direction and a second direction that crosses the first direction (col 1, ln 65-col 2, ln 7). Mitoma et al and Selby are combinable because they are analogous with respect to surface grinding processes. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the first and second directions as taught by Selby into the grinding process of Mitoma et al in order to effectively remove the spew. In regard to claim 4, Mitoma et al do not teach the claimed angle formed by the processing direction and the seam. The angle formed by a processing direction and a seam is well-known in the deburring art as an important parameter and the claimed angle would have been readily determined by routine experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art. Further, the claimed angle is well-

Art Unit: 1732

known in the deburring art thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed angle in the process of Mitoma et al in order to form a high quality deburred golf ball. In regard to claim 5, such limitation is taught by the above combination of Mitoma et al and Selby; i.e., Selby teaches a criss-cross surface grinding.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDMUND H. LEE whose telephone number is 571.272.1204. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY FROM 9AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on 571.272.1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/757,420  
Art Unit: 1732

Page 5

EDMUND H. LEE  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1732

EHL

  
6/26/06